

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1798 (303856.01)
Application No.: 10/608,481
Office Action Dated: 11/15/2006

PATENT

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached replacement sheets 1-7 replace the original sheets 1-7. FIG. 5 on sheet 6 has been amended so the reference character “520” in the left plane reads 515. Each figure has been redrafted to conform to formal requirements.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1-7.

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 16-18, and 20 are pending in this application, all of which stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,174 to Ding *et al.* (“Ding”) in view of “Screen Dumps of Microsoft Word” (“MS Word”). Following entry of the amendment, claims 1-6, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended, claims 8-15, 19, and 21-25 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 1 and 16 are the independent claims.

Restriction Requirement

The Office Action required a restriction to one of three groups of claims: Group I, claims 1-7 and 16-20; Group II, claims 8-15; or Group III, claims 21-25 (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 2). Applicant elects Group I without traverse and has canceled claims 8-15 and 21-25 drawn to the unelected groups.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) and 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). The following restates the reasons for objection and describes Applicant’s curative amendments:

1. The Office Action indicates that reference character “480” designates both a “control” and a “display area” (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 4). The Specification has been amended at paragraph 0046 so the reference character for “display area” reads “485.” Reference character “485” can be found in FIG. 4A.

2. The Office Action indicates that reference character “520” designates both a “display area” and a “control content” (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 4). The Specification has been amended at paragraph 0047 so the reference character for “control content” reads “515.” In addition, FIG. 5 has been amended so the reference character “520” in the left panel reads “515.”

3. The Office Action indicates that the reference character “14” designates both a “Network” and “Applications” (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 4). The Specification has been amended at paragraph 0040 so the reference character following “Applications” reads “320.” Reference character 320 can be found in FIG. 3.

4. The Office Action indicates that the references characters “20a,” “20b,” and “20c” appear in the written description without corresponding reference characters in the drawings (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 4). In the original specification, reference characters “20a,” “20b,” and “20c” each refer to “client computer.” The specification has been amended at paragraph 0034 so reference characters “20a,” “20b,” “20c” read “110a,” “110b,” “110c” respectively. Reference characters “110a,” “110b,” “110c” for “client computer” can be found in FIG. 2.

5. The Office Action indicates that the reference characters “10” and “20” appear in the written description without corresponding reference characters in the drawings (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 4). Reference characters “10” and “20” refer to “servers” and “client computers” respectively. The specification has been amended at paragraph 0034 so reference characters “10” and “20” read “10a, 10b” and “110a, 110b, 110c” respectively. Corresponding reference characters “10a,” “10b,” each indicate “server” in FIG. 2, and corresponding reference characters “110a,” “110b,” “110c” each indicate “client computer” in FIG. 2.

6. The Office Action indicates that the reference characters “DB Server 4” and “Data Store 4” appear in the written description without corresponding reference characters in the drawings (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 4). The specification has been amended at paragraphs 0040 and 0041 removing “DB Server 4” and “Data Store 4.”

7. The Office Action indicates that the reference character “195” of FIG. 1 appears in the drawings without a corresponding reference character in the written description (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 5). In FIG. 1 reference character “195” is associated with “output peripheral interface.” The specification has been amended at paragraph 0031 so the reference characters “190” following “output peripheral interface” reads “195.”

8. The Office Action indicates that the reference characters “110a,” “110b,” “110c” of FIG. 2 appear in the drawings without corresponding reference characters in the written description (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 5). As pointed out in note 4 above the specification has been amended at paragraph 0034 so the reference characters “20a,” “20b,” “20c” read “110a,” “110b,” “110c” respectively.

9. The Office Action indicates that the reference character “620” of FIG. 6 appears in the drawings without a corresponding reference character in the written description (*Office*

Action dated 11/15/2006 – page 5). The specification has been amended at paragraph 0048 to include the language “to display data 620” consistent with FIG. 6.

10. The Office Action pointed out three informalities in the written description (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 6). The specification has been amended at paragraph 0041, 0044, and 0035 to correct the typographical oversight.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-6, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended for clarity. The amendments do not introduce new matter. The amendments are supported at least by paragraphs 0038, 0043, 0044, 0047, 0048, FIG. 4A, and FIG. 5 of the original application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Office Action indicates that the language “small fraction” and “available computing environment” previously recited in claim 1 and the language “a small size” previously recited in claim 16 are indefinite without comparative bases (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 7). This language has been removed from the respective claims.

The Office Action indicates that the language “micro-monitor” in claims 1 and 16 is unclear as meaning either application logic or graphical user interface. The claims have been amended to more particularly point out the micro-monitor, and applicants submit that the amendments have rendered the section 112, second paragraph rejection moot.

Accordingly, applicants request that the section 112, second paragraph rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Definition of Claims over Applied Art

Claims 1-7, 16-18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the teachings of Ding in view MS Word. For the reasons below, applicants submit that these claims are not obvious over the references as applied.

Ding describes an enterprise management system that uses agents to collect metrics for displaying on a monitor console and for modeling the configuration of the enterprise (Ding Abstract, FIG. 3). Specifically, Ding describes recording the following metrics: CPU utilization, disk I/O counts (number of reads/writes), file system usage, database usage, number of threads, number of processes, kernel version, registry type, logical volume size, and paging I/O count (Ding Col 7, Lines 50-54).

Ding does not describe collecting or displaying database errors. Specifically, Ding as applied does not describe displaying “a description of the error, a time and date for the error, and a number representing the first database” as recited in claims 1 and 16. In fact, the monitor console disclosed in Ding cannot display error information because the Ding agents do not collect any information about errors.

The Office Action cites MS Word only for the purposes of certain features, such as “the size of the GUI element to be less than the whole computing environment operating display space” and “providing size adjustment controls” (*Office Action* dated 11/15/2006 – page 8-9). Applicant submits that the examiner has not applied MS Word to the features added by amendment; thus, MS Word, like Ding, does not demonstrate obviousness of independent claims 1 and 16.

Moreover, since independent claims 1 and 16 have been shown to be patentable over the art as applied, the dependent claims are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

Accordingly, Applicant submit that the Examiner has not demonstrated obviousness, and request that the section 103 rejection of claims 1-7, 16-18, and 20 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the grounds for rejection and objection having been addressed, Applicant submits that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Date: February 15, 2006

/ Michael A. Koptiw/
Michael A. Koptiw
Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439